

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/085,169	02/25/2002	Jose Castillo Deniega	IFLOW.063DV1	3825	
20995 7:	590 02/28/2005		EXAMINER		
KNOBBE MA	ARTENS OLSON &	LAM, ANN Y			
2040 MAIN ST	TREET				
FOURTEENT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
IRVINE, CA 92614			1641		

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/085,169		DENIEGA			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Ann Y. Lam		1641			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the co	over sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess		
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory irre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the departent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, ation. ys, a reply within the statutory y period will apply and will ex by statute, cause the applicate.	however, may a reply be tim y minimum of thirty (30) days prire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.		
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 14 December 2004	<b>1</b> .				
		☐ This action is non-					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are rejecte Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	awn from considerati	ion.				
Applicati	ion Papers						
10) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Ex- The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[ Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) be h correction is required i	eld in abeyance. Seef the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1	• •		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) <u></u> / a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been re uments have been re e priority documents Bureau (PCT Rule 1	eceived. eceived in Applications have been receive 7.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	nge		
Attachment	Ma\						
Attachment  1) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	☐ Interview Summary (	(PTO_413)			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/97 r No(s)/Mail Date	48) (SB/08) 5)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da		2)		

Application/Control Number: 10/085,169

Art Unit: 1641

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072.

As to claims 1 and 5, Lampropoulos et al. discloses an elongated tube having a plurality of exit holes increasing in size along the length of the catheter (column 7, lines 57-67), so that a fluid flowing therein will flow through substantially all of said exit holes at a substantially equal rate (column 7, lines 57-67), a lumen of said catheter having a cross-sectional flow area, said exit holes having a non-variable, combined cross-sectional flow area less than the flow area of the lumen so that the exit holes define a flow restricting orifice of the catheter (column 8, lines 8-13), the catheter being formed from a material that is non-reactive to anatomical system. (Since the slots are normally in a closed position, the cross-sectional area of the slots are considered to be smaller than the cross section area of the lumen.)

As to claim 5, since Lampropoulos discloses such a catheter, Lampropoulos therefore discloses the steps of manufacturing the catheter, including the step of providing exit holes having a non-variable size.

Art Unit: 1641

As to claims 2 and 6, the holes are provided throughout the circumference of the catheter (see figure 6).

As to claims 7 and 11, the exit holes are in at least one row aligned with a longitudinal axis of the catheter (see fig. 16.)

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072.

Lampropoulos discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see above), except for the specific diameter of the exit holes.

The diameter of the exit holes that would achieve the optimum results, i.e., the most uniform delivery of fluids, as taught by Lampropoulos, can be discovered through routine experimentation and thus would be obvious. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072, in view of Stevens, 5,536,261.

Lampropoulos et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed (see above).

Lampropoulos teaches that the catheter is useful for providing fluid to the central venous system (col. 3, lines 21-23.) However, Lampropoulos does not teach that the catheter has a closed distal end.

Stevens, discloses a catheter having openings for fluid delivery in the circulatory system. Stevens teaches that the catheter has a closed distal end which encourages lateral flow as would be desirable for fluid delivery in the circulatory system (col. 2, lines 35-37.) It would have been obvious to provide a closed end as taught by Stevens on the Lampropoulos catheter because Stevens teaches that a closed distal end provides the advantage of encouraging lateral flow desirable for delivering fluid in the circulatory system, which includes the central venous system.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 14, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the Lampropoulos reference does not disclose or suggest holes having a non-variable cross-sectional flow area, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed

Art Unit: 1641

invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

In this case, the Lampropoulos holes are capable of being non-variable. The holes are considered non-variable when they are not varying, for example, when no fluid is going through them. Examiner suggests Applicant amend the claims to recite structural limitations to distinguish over the prior art.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Sat 11-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/085,169

Art Unit: 1641

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.L.

LONG V. LE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

02/20/05